



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,885	01/29/2004	Nobukazu Suzuki	03500.017861.	2302
5514	7590	07/10/2008	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			ZHU, RICHARD Z	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,885	SUZUKI, NOBUKAZU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RICHARD Z. ZHU	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/28/2008 has been entered.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

2. Applicant's argument in view of the amendment to the claims are persuasive, rejections set forth in the previous office action are withdrawn. Upon further reexamination, new grounds of rejections are entered for this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 and 11-13 are under 35 USC 103 (a) over ***Dow et al. (US 6784904 B2)*** in view of ***Yoshida (US 6178005 B1)*** and ***Meisner et al (US 6862102 B1)***.

Regarding Claim 1, *Dow* discloses a method of reading a plurality of originals placed on an original support and displaying it (Fig 1A and see Col 5, Rows 27-34, liquid crystal display and see Fig 8), comprising:

an image reading step of reading (Fig 2, Capture Page Module 78 and see Col 7, Rows 6-7) each of the images of the originals placed on the original support to generate image signals (Col 7, Rows 4-7, conversion to a suitable format for storage requires the generation of an image signal of the original that is scanned);

a placement orientation detection step (Fig 2, Thumbnail Page View Module 82 and see Col 7, Rows 7-10) of detecting placement orientation of said original based on the image signal generated in said image reading step (Col 7, Rows 7-10 and 53-63, the default display constitute images of the original orientation the scanned original is initially in.

The mere act of displaying the image in an original orientation and the fact that the user can rotate the orientation by 90° require a placement orientation detection step in order for the device to properly perform the steps as disclosed in the cited portion of the reference);

an image signal rotation step of rotating (Fig 1A, Rotation Button 32 and see Col 7, Rows 5-13 and 53-63), when the placement orientation of said original detected in said placement orientation detection step is different from a predetermined orientation (Col 7, Rows 53-58, “default state” is the state in which the display generates and displays an image in an original orientation, or the placement orientation), said image signal to said predetermined orientation (the user change the default state to rotate state which rotates

the image by 90° which is a predetermined orientation different from the placement orientation); and

a read image signal display step (**Fig 1A, Display 24 and Col 7, Rows 5-10**) of displaying the plurality of read image signals on one display screen (**Fig 8C and Fig 8F, navigating through all 25 images, see Col 10, Rows 1-5**) in an orientation aligned with a predetermined orientation (**Col 7, Rows 53-63, the rotated image is display onto the LCD**).

Dow does not disclose determining as to whether it is landscape or portrait.

Yoshida discloses determining as to whether an image is landscape (**Col 6, Rows 64-67**) or portrait (**Col 7, Rows 24-29**) based on the image signal generated in an image reading step.

It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of *Dow* with the ability to determine placement orientation of image to check if it is landscape or portrait, as suggested by *Yoshida* in order to provide an image processing apparatus having improved ease of operation (*Yoshida, Col 2, Rows 11-13*).

The combined teachings do not teach displaying a plurality of read image signals at the same time on one display screen.

Meisner discloses an image preview apparatus (**Fig 1**) for displaying a plurality of read image signals at the same time on one display screen (**Fig 3 and see Col 5, Row 48 – Col 6, Row 14**).

Meisner demonstrated that it is a well known technique in the art of image preview to display a plurality of read image signals at the same time on one display screen. Therefore, it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adopt

the known technique suggested by *Meisner* into the known device of the combined teachings to have a predictable resulting apparatus for displaying a plurality of images at different orientations at the same time whereas the motivation would've been to allow the user to conveniently elect a chosen variation of a plurality of edited images (**Meisner, Col 5, Rows 55-60**).

Regarding Claim 2, *Dow* discloses a method of displaying a read image signal further comprising a display orientation setting step (**Fig 1A, Rotation Button 32**) of setting said predetermined orientation (**Col 7, Rows 60-63**).

Regarding Claim 3, *Dow* discloses a method of displaying a plurality of read image signals further comprising

a second image signal rotation step of rotating said plurality of image signals by a predetermined angle (**Col 7, Rows 53-63, activation of rotation button will rotate said image signal by a predetermined angle**) irrespective of the placement orientation detected in said placement orientation detection step (**Col 7, Rows 53-57, the orientation detected in the default state is the placement orientation**), and

a second display orientation setting step of setting whether the images are to be displayed in the orientation aligned with said predetermined orientation or the images rotated by said second image signal rotation step is to be displayed (**If the user chooses to activate rotation button 32, the image that is rotated by 90° relative to the placement orientation will be displayed by display 24**).

Regarding Claim 4, *Dow* discloses a method of displaying a read image signal wherein said second display orientation setting step can optionally set to display the image in

the orientation detected in the placement orientation detection step (**Col 7, Rows 53-63, the user chooses not to activate the rotate button 32, the image will be displayed in an orientation that is originally detected when the image is initially captured**).

Regarding Claim 5, Dow discloses a method of displaying a read image signal wherein said second image signal rotation step further includes upon rotating the image signal by the predetermined angle, correcting its little inclination with respect to a vertical or horizontal direction (**Col 7, Rows 53-63, if the user chooses to activate the rotate button 32, the image will be displayed in an orientation that is rotated by a predetermined angle relative to the orientation originally detected when the image is initially captured**. This is accomplished by correcting the inclination of the image signal with respect to a vertical or horizontal direction).

Regarding Claim 6, Dow discloses a method of displaying a read image signal wherein in said image reading step, a plurality of originals placed on the original support are read (**scanning a plurality of original is determine by the user in accordance to user defined necessity**) and the other steps are performed on an image signal obtained from each of the originals individually (**Col 7, Row 63 – Col 8, Row 6, other steps includes magnifying, capture, send, delete, attach, detach and etc**).

Regarding the Method of Claim 11 and the System of Claim 12, Dow discloses a system (**Fig 1 A-D**) for displaying image information, wherein when image information of a plurality of originals that is different in its horizontal and vertical lengths placed on an original support is read by an image reading apparatus (**Fig 8C and 8F, the image captured is different in its horizontal length and vertical length**) and said read image is displayed

on a display apparatus in a thumbnail display form (**Fig 2, Thumbnail View Module 82 and see Col 7, Rows 7-8**), placement orientations of said plurality of originals placed on said original support are detected (**Col 7, Rows 7-10 and 53-63, the default display constitute images of the original orientation the scanned original is initially in. The mere act of displaying the image in an original orientation and the fact that the user can rotate the orientation by 90° require a placement orientation detection step in order for the device to properly perform the steps as disclosed in the cited portion of the reference**) and said image information are displayed in a state in which a horizontal or vertical direction of the image information of said plurality of original are aligned in a predetermined orientation irrespective of the detected placement orientations of said plurality of originals (**Col 7, Rows 53-63, the user chooses to rotate the image by a predetermined angle to change its orientation, the image information is displayed in a state in which a horizontal or vertical direction of the image information of said original is aligned in a predetermined orientation irrespective of the detected placement orientation of said original**).

The combined teachings do not teach displaying a plurality of read image signals at the same time on one display screen.

Meisner discloses an image preview apparatus (**Fig 1**) for displaying a plurality of read image signals at the same time on one display screen (**Fig 3 and see Col 5, Row 48 – Col 6, Row 14**).

Meisner demonstrated that it is a well known technique in the art of image preview to display a plurality of read image signals at the same time on one display screen. Therefore, it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adopt

the known technique suggested by *Meisner* into the known device of the combined teachings to have a predictable resulting apparatus for displaying a plurality of images at different orientations at the same time whereas the motivation would've been to allow the user to conveniently elect a chosen variation of a plurality of edited images (**Meisner, Col 5, Rows 55-60**).

Regarding the computer program implemented on a computer readable medium of Claims 13, *Dow* discloses a computer program stored in memory to execute the process of the scanner (Fig 2 and see Col 6, Rows 5-19).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over the combined teachings of *Dow et al. (US 6784904 B2)*, *Yoshida (US 6178005 B1)* and *Meisner et al (US 6862102 B1)* in view of *Ichihara et al. (US 5198853 B1)*.

Regarding Claim 8, the combined teachings do not explicitly disclose a method of displaying a read image signal wherein in said placement orientation detection step, the placement orientation is detected based on comparison of a vertical size and a horizontal size of the image signal.

Ichihara discloses a method detecting placement orientation based on comparison of a vertical size and a horizontal size of the image signal (**Fig 6 and see Col 3, Rows 21-38.**

Judgment means for judging document size, and/or placement orientation, base on length and width).

Dow and *Ichihara* are in the field of scanners.

It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly adapt the program of **Dow** of the combined teachings to detect placement orientation base on vertical size and horizontal size of the scanned image as suggested by **Ichihara**. The motivation would've been to provide a constitution that "wherein image signals are integrated both in the main scanning direction and in the auxiliary scanning direction, noise components caused by copy soil existing on the peripheral area of a document are eliminated and thereby it is possible to detect the document size based on the image data free from noise components" (**Ichihara, Col 4, Rows 36-42**).

Therefore, it would've been obvious to combine **Dow** and **Ichihara** to obtain the invention set forth in Claim 8.

6. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over the combined teachings of **Dow et al. (US 6784904 B2)**, **Yoshida (US 6178005 B1)** and **Meisner et al (US 6862102 B1)** in view of **Miyata et al. (US 4825250 A)**.

Regarding Claim 9, the combined teachings do not teach an image area of the original placed on the original support is cut out to generate the image signal.

Miyata discloses an image area of the original placed on the original support is cut out to generate the image signal (**Fig 12 and 14 and see Abstract**).

Dow and **Miyata** are in the field of scanners.

It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reprogram the scanner of **Dow** of the combined teachings with parameter to automatically generate a masking function and cut out an image area of the original. The motivation would've been to "to provide an image forming apparatus which can automatically erase the

unnecessary portions of a plurality of images set on the original plate and then automatically perform overlay of those image" (***Miyata, Col 2, Rows 32-37***)

Therefore, it would've been obvious to combine ***Dow*** and ***Miyata*** to obtain the invention set forth in Claim 9.

Regarding Claim 10, *Miyata* discloses an effective image area of the original in the form of a film placed on the original support is cut out to generate the image signal (***Fig 9 and see Col 11, Rows 25-30***).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US 5486893 A and US 6333752 B1 discloses image processing apparatus for displaying a plurality of edited images at the same time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Richard Z. Zhu whose telephone number is 571-270-1587 or examiner's supervisor King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. Examiner Richard Zhu can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 6:30 - 5:00.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RZ²
05/13/2008

Richard Z. Zhu
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2625

/King Y. Poon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625